

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 1170-03  
Bill No.: SS for SCS for HB 542 with SA1, SA2, SA3, and SA4  
Subject: Agriculture and Animals; Agriculture Department; County Government; General Assembly; Taxation and Revenue - Property  
Type: Original  
Date: May 1, 2013

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to agriculture.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
General Revenue	\$27,495 to (\$72,505)	\$72,325 to (\$27,675)	Less than \$104,825
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund</b>	<b>\$27,495 to (\$72,505)</b>	<b>\$72,325 to (\$27,675)</b>	<b>Less than \$104,825</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 16 pages.

Note: No fiscal impact is shown for § 348.521; however, changes to this section increases the state's overall financial exposure from \$20,000 to \$50,000 per loan if defaulted.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
Agriculture Protection*	\$0	\$0	\$0
Career and Technical Education Board *	\$0	\$0	\$0
Urban Agricultural Zone Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

\* Revenues and expenditures net to zero

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

- Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### §§ 64.196, 323.100 and 413.225 - Propane Meters and Metrology Lab Fees:

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HCS #2 for HB 927, the following responded:

**Oversight** assumes this section of the proposal will increase propane meter fees from \$10/meter to \$25/meter on January 1, 2014 and from \$25 to \$50/meter on January 1, 2015 and from \$50 to \$75/meter on January 1, 2016. The propane meter testing fee will be set at \$75 thereafter.

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture (AGR)** assume the propane meter and metrology laboratory programs will become more self sufficient from fees collected and deposited to the Agriculture Protection Fund (APF) as a result of this section of the proposal. AGR assumes a savings to General Revenue in the amount of the increased fee revenues.

AGR assumes the following changes to propane meter and metrology lab fees.

#### Propane Meters:

Estimated FY14 revenue increase for APF = 433 propane meters (one-third of total will be inspected in the first 6 months) X \$15/meter additional revenue = \$6,495

- **Total FY14 additional revenues = \$6,495**

Estimated FY15 revenue increase for APF:

- 867 propane meters (two-thirds of total will be inspected at the \$25/meter rate in the first 6 months of the FY) X \$15/meter additional revenue = \$13,005
- 433 propane meters at the \$50/meter rate (one-third of total will be inspected in the last 6 months of the FY) X \$40/meter additional revenue = \$17,320
- **Total FY15 additional revenues = \$30,325**

Estimated FY16 revenue increase for APF:

- 867 propane meters (two-thirds of total will be inspected at the \$50/meter rate in the first 6 months of the FY) X \$40/meter additional revenue = \$34,680
- 433 propane meters at the \$75/meter rate (one-third of total will be inspected in the last 6 months of the FY) X \$65/meter additional revenue = \$28,145
- **Total FY16 additional revenues = \$62,825**

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Metrology Laboratory:

Metrology calibration fees will increase from \$60/hour to \$120/hour on January 1, 2014.

Estimated **FY14** revenue increase for APF = 350 hours X \$60/hour additional revenue = **\$21,000.**

**FY 15** and **FY16** revenues = 700 hours X \$60/hour additional revenue = **\$42,000.**

AGR state General Revenue funds used by the metrology laboratory program will decline by the same amounts.

**Table 1: Total Revenue Changes for Propane Meter and Metrology Laboratory Programs**

	Propane	Metrology	Total
FY 14	\$6,495	\$21,000	\$27,495
FY 15	\$30,325	\$42,000	\$72,325
FY 16	\$62,825	\$42,000	\$104,825

Source: Department of Agriculture

These increased fee revenues will replace General Revenue currently used by AGR to operate these programs.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this section of the proposal would allow the Department of Agriculture Director to adjust certain weights and measures fees annually based on the total expenses for administering the programs so that fees will cover the expenses for the following year. This section would have no impact on BAP, but could have an unknown fiscal impact on the 18e calculation and total state revenues.

**Oversight** assumes the increased fee rates of the propane meter and metrology lab programs will result in a savings to general revenue equal to the increased fee revenue received by the Agriculture Protection Fund.

**This section of the proposal could increase Total State Revenues.**

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§ 178.550 - Career and Technical Education Advisory Council:

In response to similar legislation from 2013, SB17, officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** stated that it is not possible to calculate a fiscal impact for this due to uncertainty as to whether or not the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education would continue to be regarded by the U.S. Office of Education as the “eligible agency” responsible for the administration of career and technical education under the “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006,” as is currently the case. The loss of the determination of “eligible agency” would result in the reduction of \$26 million in federal funding now provided through this act. To maintain career technical funding at the current level would require an additional \$26 million of state revenue.

DESE stated until the make up of the council is determined, we cannot estimate costs; however, we do not anticipate significant costs.

**Oversight** notes that the Carl D Perkins Vocation and Technical Education Act (Perkins Act) was first authorized by the federal government in 1984 and reauthorized in 1998. In 2006, the act was reauthorized through 2012, after passing almost unanimously in Congress. The Perkins Act provided \$1.14 billion in federal support for career and technical education programs in all 50 states in 2012. According to the Arne Duncan, U.S. Secretary of Education, the Perkins Act will be reformed and updated prior to reauthorization.

**Oversight** assumes the board to be created by this section of the proposal would be an avenue to align with current recommendations for reform of the Perkins Act. Even if the Perkins Act is not reauthorized, the board would be in place to oversee and coordinate career and technical education. Administrative costs of the board are not expected to exceed \$100,000 per year.

§ 196.311 - Eggs:

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** and **Department of Health and Senior Services** each assume this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

**Oversight** assumes there is no direct fiscal impact from this section of the proposal on state or local government funds.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§ 267.655 - Missouri Livestock Disease Control and Eradication Law

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HB 927, the following responded:

According to officials from **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning** , since this section imposes a civil penalty of up to \$1,000 for violations of the Missouri Livestock Disease Control and Eradication Law it could increase Total State Revenue by an unknown amount.

According to officials from the **Department of Agriculture**, any monies collected through civil penalties would be deposited into the County School Fund.

**Oversight** assumes the number of cases resulting in additional civil penalties impacting total state revenue would be minimal and, for fiscal note purposes only, show no direct fiscal impact from this section of the proposal.

§ 262.900 - Urban Agricultural Zones:

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 228, the following responded:

Officials at the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning** assumed this proposal creates a mechanism for certain municipalities to create Urban Agricultural Zones (UAZ) to encourage agricultural production and community education. This proposal directs sales taxes on products sold within the UAZ into the Urban Agricultural Zone Fund, except those sales taxes that are constitutionally dedicated, or for school districts, or on motor vehicles. Therefore, this proposal will reduce General Revenue by an unknown amount.

Real property in the UAZ is to be exempt from assessment and taxation for the first ten years. This proposal could reduce local revenues, including those for schools. This could also reduce Total State Revenue if Blind Pension Fund receipts decline.

Grower-UAZs are provided water at wholesale rates and provided discounts on hook-ups. This may reduce municipal revenues if the municipality is the water provider.

**Oversight** assumes this substitute limits the sales taxes diverted to the UAZ Fund to local sales taxes and therefore, will not reflect an impact to General Revenue from this part of the proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at the **Department of Agriculture (AGR)** assumed the fiscal impact of this proposal is unknown. It is not possible to estimate with any accuracy the number of UAZ that will be formed, their location, the types of agricultural products that will be produced, or the amount of sales tax revenue realized from the sale of products in the UAZ.

Officials at the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assumed they would need to make form and computer programming changes to various tax systems. These changes are estimated to cost \$41,765 for 1,544 FTE hours.

**Oversight** assumes DOR is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of computer programming activity each year. Oversight assumes DOR could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DOR could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials at the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume this proposal appears to allow a person or organization to develop an UAZ (urban agricultural zone) on a blighted area of land within a municipality. In general, tax subsidies reduce the state's tax revenues and decrease the amount of money available for public schools and all public school students. Given the subject matter, "blighted areas" are not likely to reap additional sales tax revenues; however, it is impossible to determine whether the blighted area might have generated revenues independent of this proposal. Ultimately, the impact of this proposal is dependent upon the unknown actions of persons and/or organizations as well as future sales tax revenues which cannot be predicted at this time. Therefore, any impact is unknown.

Officials from the **City of Columbia** state the city provides municipal water service. The city would expect to lose revenue from exemptions on paying water connections and usage fees and loss of property tax revenue, including taxes diverted to the school district.

In response to similar legislation filed this year (SB 228), officials at the **City of Kansas City (KC)** stated they are unable to determine the impact of this proposal, but revenue growth can be assumed to exist through increased agricultural activity in the city. With regard to section 4 requiring a municipality to sell water at a wholesale rate and reduce the cost to tap into the water system, this approach would undermine the cost-of-service basis for water rates and potentially result in a \$150 million dollar revenue loss. It would expose the city to an argument that water fees are a tax subject to the Hancock Amendment.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

KC assumed while the city would lose sales and real property tax revenues, a project need not be approved if those losses are not offset in their entirety (or exceeded) by increases in other revenues.

**Oversight** assumes that no city, county, school or other local political subdivision would be affected by this proposal unless an Urban Agricultural Zone (UAZ) was created in their area.

**Oversight** assumes it is unclear how many Urban Agricultural Zones would be created in this State. Additionally, any sales tax revenue generated in the UAZ will be required per this proposal to be transferred to the Urban Agricultural Zone Fund. Therefore Oversight will show the revenue reduction to General Revenue and the revenue increase to the UAZ Fund as \$0 (no UAZ created) to Unknown.

**Oversight** assumes that all money received by the Urban Agricultural Zone Fund will be used for administration of this program according to the guidelines established in this proposal.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal allows for the UAZ to purchase water at wholesale prices. Political subdivisions that own their own water and light departments would be affected by this proposal. Therefore Oversight will show the revenue reduction to Local Political Subdivision Funds as \$0 (no UAZ created) to Unknown.

**Oversight** assumes the creation of this new program outlined in this proposal may have an impact on the overall economy of the state. However, Oversight considers this to be indirect impact of the proposal and will not reflect it in this fiscal note.

§ 348.521 - Livestock Feed and Crop Loan Guarantee:

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HB 412, the following responded:

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** and **Department of Economic Development** each assumed this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assumed this section of the proposal would increase the maximum loan amount for the Livestock Feed and Crop Input Loan Guarantee Program and could impact general revenue if loans are defaulted.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

BAP assumed the section does not change current statutory caps limiting the amount to be spent on loan guarantees at \$4 million.

**Oversight** assumes this section of the proposal permits the Missouri Agricultural and Small Business Development Authority to increase the maximum livestock feed and crop input loan guarantees from \$40,000 to \$100,000.

**Oversight** assumes in the event of a default on a livestock feed and crop input loan, the State of Missouri will provide a 50% first loss guarantee for the purchase of livestock feed used to produce livestock or inputs used to produce livestock feed. Currently the state liability is \$20,000 per loan and this section of the proposal will increase the state's liability to \$50,000 per loan.

**Oversight** assumes any livestock feed and crop input loan default would have a direct impact on the state General Revenue Fund. However, since the program's inception, no loan default has occurred. Therefore, **Oversight** assumes no direct fiscal impact on state or local government funds, but this section of the proposal would increase the state's overall financial exposure.

Bill as a Whole:

Officials from the **Office of Governor** assume there should be no added cost to the Governor's Office as a result of this measure. However, if additional duties are placed on the office related to appointments in other TAFP legislation, there may be the need for additional staff resources in future years.

Officials from the **University of Central Missouri, Missouri State University** and the **State Treasurer's Office** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

SA1 § 644.052 - Fees for modifications to water permits:

**Oversight** assumes this amendment would not have a material fiscal impact to the Department of Natural Resources of local political subdivisions. Therefore, Oversight will not reflect impact in the fiscal note from this amendment.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

SA2 § 640.725 - Monitoring of flush system animal waste wet handling facilities:

**Oversight** assumes this amendment would not have a material fiscal impact to the Department of Natural Resources of local political subdivisions. Therefore, Oversight will not reflect impact in the fiscal note from this amendment.

SA3 § 262.598 - University of Missouri Extension Councils:

In response to a similar proposal from this year (Perfectured SB 9), **Oversight** received the following responses:

Officials from the **Platte County Board of Election Commissioners** assumed there would be costs for an election for any county conducting an election. Costs per election would range from \$50,000 to \$60,000, depending upon the number of other participants involved in any specific election, as costs would be pro-rated based upon the number of registered voters within each district.

In response to the introduced bill, officials from the **Kansas City Election Board (KCEB)** stated the cost to conduct a city-wide general municipal election can range up to \$350,000 depending on the number of entities participating and the number of registered voters in each jurisdiction requesting the election. The KCEB would need more information about the size and locations of these "districts" before they could give a more accurate estimate of these costs.

**Oversight** assumes this part of the proposal is discretionary and would have no local fiscal impact without action by the governing body.

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education, Department of Revenue, Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning, State Tax Commission, Office of State Courts Administrator, Office of Secretary of State - Elections Division, St. Louis County,** and the **University of Missouri** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

SA4 - change to § 262.900 - Urban Agricultural Zones:

This amendment appears to exempt St. Charles County from the provisions of the chapter. **Oversight** assumes the amendment would not create a direct fiscal impact to the state or to local

political subdivisions.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
	(10 Mo.)		
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<u>Savings - AGR</u>			
§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Reduced general revenue appropriation for weights and measures programs	\$27,495	\$72,325	\$104,825
<u>Transfer Out - To the Career and Technical Education Board Fund - (\$178.550)</u>	(Expected to be less than <u>\$100,000</u> )	(Expected to be less than <u>\$100,000</u> )	(Expected to be less than <u>\$100,000</u> )
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>\$27,495 to (\$72,505)</u></b>	<b><u>\$72,325 to (\$27,675)</u></b>	<b><u>Less than \$104,825</u></b>

**AGRICULTURE PROTECTION  
FUND**

<u>Revenue - AGR</u>			
§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Increased fee revenue for Propane Meters and Metrology lab programs	\$27,495	\$72,325	\$104,825
<u>Cost - AGR</u>			
§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Operating expense of Propane Meters and Metrology lab programs	<u>(\$27,495)</u>	<u>(\$72,325)</u>	<u>(\$104,825)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE AGRICULTURE PROTECTION FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>

**FISCAL IMPACT - State Government**                      **FY 2014**                      **FY 2015**                      **FY 2016**  
 (continued)    (10 Mo.)

**CAREER AND TECHNICAL  
 EDUCATION BOARD FUND**

<u>Transfer In</u> - From General Revenue	Expected to be	Expected to be	Expected to be
§178.550 - Advisory Council	less than	less than	less than
	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>

<u>Disbursements</u> -	(Expected to be	(Expected to be	(Expected to be
§178.550 - Administrative costs of	less than	less than	less than
new Advisory Council	<u>\$100,000</u> )	<u>\$100,000</u> )	<u>\$100,000</u> )

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON          CAREER AND TECHNICAL          EDUCATION BOARD FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>
--	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

**URBAN AGRICULTURAL ZONE  
 FUND**

<u>Revenue</u> - collection of taxes in the UAZ	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
- § 262.900			

<u>Cost</u> - administration of the program	\$0 to	\$0 to	\$0 to
§ 262.900	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON          URBAN AGRICULTURAL ZONE          FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>
---	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>			
<u>Revenue Reduction</u> - Local Political Subdivisions - Loss of property taxes, sales taxes and also water sold at wholesale prices - § 262.900 (UAZs)	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>	<b>\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u></b>	<b>\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u></b>	<b>\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u></b>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

§ 196.311 - Eggs:

Small business farmers that sell such eggs could be positively impacted as a result of this section of the proposal.

§ 262.900 - Urban Agricultural Zones:

Small businesses participating in the UAZ could be impacted.

§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Propane Meters and Metrology Lab Fees:

Small businesses that pay metrology and propane meter fees will now pay these fees at a higher rate.

§ 348.521 - Livestock Feed and Crop Loan Guarantee:

Direct fiscal impact to small business farmers could result from this section of the proposal.

## FISCAL DESCRIPTION

### § 178.550 - Career and Technical Education Advisory Council:

This section of the proposal establishes the Career and Technical Education Student Protection Act and the Career and Technical Education Board to oversee and coordinate career and technical education and student organizations' activities in Missouri, replacing the State Advisory Committee for Vocational Education.

### § 262.900 - Urban Agricultural Zones:

This proposal authorizes a person or organization to apply to an incorporated municipality to develop an urban agricultural zone (UAZ) on a blighted area of land.

### §§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Propane Meters and Metrology Lab Fees:

This section of the proposal sets the testing fees of all meters used for the measurement and sale of liquefied petroleum gas at \$10. On January 1, 2014, the fee will increase to \$25, and the fee will increase to \$50 on January 1, 2015. On January 1, 2016, and thereafter, the fee will be set at \$75. The Director must also publish any change to the testing fee schedule on the departmental website within 30 days of a change.

This section of the proposal also allows fees collected for registration, inspection, and calibration to be deposited into the Agriculture Protection Fund as set forth in section 261.200. Laboratory fees for metrology calibrations will be increased from \$25 to \$60 beginning August 28, 2013 and will be computed to the nearest 1/4 hour. On January 1, 2014, and thereafter, the Director of Agriculture shall fix a fee schedule for the ensuing year at a rate per hour that will not yield revenue greater than the total cost of operation.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Agriculture  
Department of Economic Development  
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Department of Health and Senior Services  
Department of Revenue  
Office of Governor  
Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning  
State Treasurer's Office  
University of Central Missouri  
Missouri State University  
City of Columbia  
City of Kansas City



Ross Strope  
Acting Director  
May 1, 2013